

Many-polaron states in the Holstein-Hubbard model

Laurent Proville and Serge Aubry*

Groupe de Physique des Solides, UMR 7588-CNRS

Universités Paris 7 & Paris 6, Tour 23, 2 pl. Jussieu 75251, Paris Cedex 05, France

* Laboratoire Léon Brillouin (CEA-CNRS), CEA Saclay 91191-Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France

Abstract

A variational approach is proposed to determine some properties of the adiabatic Holstein-Hubbard model which describes the interactions between a static atomic lattice and an assembly of fermionic charge carriers. The sum of the electronic energy and the lattice elastic energy is proved to have minima with a polaron structure in a certain domain of the phase diagram. Our analytical work consists in the expansion of these energy minima from the zero electronic transfer limit which remarkably holds for a finite amplitude of the onsite Hubbard repulsion and for an unbounded lattice size.

Key words: polaron; bipolaron; Holstein; Hubbard.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Holstein model involves an electron-phonon coupling [1] which yields a polaron ground-state provided the amplitude of this coupling is large enough compared with the electronic transfer integral. This result was demonstrated by S. Aubry *et al.* in Ref. [2] by assuming that the lattice modes have a negligible kinetic energy. In this adiabatic regime, the description of phonons is given by the static atomic displacements. During the last decade, the so called small polaron of the adiabatic Holstein model has been of a great interest to investigate some challenging problems such as: charge density wave [3–5] and

high critical temperature superconductivity [6–8]. These studies were based on the rigorous Aubry’s proof [2] which has been improved by C. Baesens and R. S. MacKay in Ref. [9]. In the anti-integrable (AI) limit where the transfer integral of the fermionic charges is zero (see [10] for a revue about the anti-integrability), it is possible to find the explicit forms of the Hamiltonian eigenstates and to expand them numerically with respect to the charge transfer.

With no electron-electron interaction, excepted the Pauli principle, a many-electron problem is usually reduced to find the eigenstates of one particle Hamiltonian in which is introduced a chemical potential to fix the charge density (see [2,5] for the case of the Holstein model). The ground state is thus given by the product of the one particle eigenstates, energies of which are smaller than the Fermi level. In some cases, the interplay of the Coulombian interaction with a charge screening may yield an onsite Hubbard repulsion which breaks this method. After extending the Holstein model with the Hubbard interaction, it is yet possible to develop a variational approach where the energy functional F_{ad} is issued from the bracketing of the adiabatic Holstein Hubbard Hamiltonian. Minimizing this functional with respect to the displacement fields, for a zero charge transfer t shows that some energy minima are the products of onsite polaron, onsite bipolaron and vacuum site. For the weak value of t , the study of the first derivatives of F_{ad} with respect to the atomic displacements indicates at least one energy minimum with a displacement field which is similar to a AI polaron structure. In the L_∞ norm meaning, the distance between this minimum and the AI polaron state is bounded by a charge transfer function which goes to zero continuously. As a consequence, in the vicinity of the AI limit, the displacement fields

of the many-polaron minima are proved to evolve continuously with t which implies that the F_{ad} potential has some polaron-type minima in a finite domain of the phase diagram.

II. ADIABATIC HOLSTEIN HUBBARD MODEL

The Holstein Hubbard Hamiltonian is written as follows:

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_i \hbar\omega_0(a_i^\dagger a_i) + gn_i(a_i^\dagger + a_i) + vn_{i,\uparrow}n_{i,\downarrow} - \nu n_i - T \sum_{(i;j),\sigma} C_{i,\sigma}^\dagger C_{j,\sigma} \quad (2.1)$$

where the atomic lattice is mapped on $\mathcal{Z}^d$, i.e., $i \in \mathcal{Z}^d$ with $d = \{1, 2, 3\}$, the annihilation operators at site $i \in \mathcal{Z}^d$ for both phonons and fermions are a_i and C_i , respectively. The corresponding creation operators are written with a dag exponent. The n_i operator is given by $\sum_{\sigma=(\uparrow,\downarrow)} C_{i,\sigma}^\dagger C_{i,\sigma}$ and the sum $\sum_{(i;j)}$ is performed over the i neighboring site indexes. For simplicity, the phonon contribution is only one optical phonon branch with frequency ω_0 . The electron-phonon coupling amplitude is g , the onsite Hubbard repulsion is scaled by $v > 0$ and the chemical potential is noted ν . The displacement and momentum operators at site (i) are given by:

$$u_i = \frac{\hbar\omega_0}{4g}(a_i^\dagger + a_i) \quad (2.2)$$

$$p_i = i\frac{2g}{\hbar\omega_0}(a_i^\dagger - a_i) \quad (2.3)$$

Substituting the phonon operators in Eq.(2.1) and dividing this equation by the energy parameter $E_0 = \frac{8g^2}{\hbar\omega_0}$ give:

$$H = \sum_i \left(\frac{1}{2}u_i^2 + \left(\frac{u_i}{2} - \mu\right)n_i + Un_{i\uparrow}n_{i\downarrow} \right) - t \sum_{(i;j),\sigma} C_{i,\sigma}^\dagger C_{j,\sigma} + \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_i p_i^2 \quad (2.4)$$

where H is an adimensional Hamiltonian with the parameters:

$$U = \frac{v}{E_0} \quad t = \frac{T}{E_0} \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{\hbar\omega_0}{2g} \right)^4 \quad \mu = \frac{\nu}{E_0} \quad (2.5)$$

In the adiabatic limit, the coefficient γ is neglected which is valid at large electron-phonon coupling, i.e., the amplitude g is large compared with the phonon zero point energy $\hbar\omega_0/2$.

We obtain an adiabatic Hamiltonian:

$$H_{ad} = \sum_i \left(\frac{1}{2} u_i^2 + \left(\frac{u_i}{2} - \mu \right) n_i + U n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} \right) - t \sum_{(i:j),\sigma} C_{i,\sigma}^\dagger C_{j,\sigma} \quad (2.6)$$

The displacement operators $\{u_i\}$ are now scalar variables that are noted as a vector $\vec{u} \in \mathcal{S}(N)$ where $\mathcal{S}(N) = \mathcal{R}^N$ is a real space, dimension of which is equal to the unbounded number of lattice sites N . The adiabatic Hamiltonian is a sum of an electronic Hamiltonian H_{el} and the lattice elastic energy, i.e., $H_{ad} = \sum_i \frac{1}{2} u_i^2 + H_{el}$ where

$$H_{el} = \sum_i \left(\frac{u_i}{2} - \mu \right) n_i + U n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} - t \sum_{(i:j),\sigma} C_{i,\sigma}^\dagger C_{j,\sigma} \quad (2.7)$$

The energy is now written in the variational form:

$$F(\vec{u}, \psi) = \sum_i \frac{1}{2} u_i^2 + \langle \psi | H_{el} | \psi \rangle \quad (2.8)$$

where $|\psi\rangle$ is a normalized electronic wave function for N_{el} fermion charges. It is projected on the usual fermion basis, i.e., $|\psi\rangle = \sum_\nu \psi_\nu |e_\nu\rangle$ where ν is a N_{el} -multiple site-spin index and $|e_\nu\rangle = \prod_{(i,\sigma_i) \in \nu} C_{i,\sigma_i}^\dagger |\emptyset\rangle$. Differentiating Eq.(2.8) with respect to u_i and ψ_ν , the conditions for the local extrema are:

$$u_i = -\frac{\langle \psi | n_i | \psi \rangle}{2} \quad (2.9)$$

$$H_{el}|\psi\rangle = E|\psi\rangle \quad (2.10)$$

where E is the Lagrange factor due to the ψ normalization. The Shroedinger equation Eq.(2.10) implies that ψ is a H_{el} eigenstate with the associated eigenvalue E which is the electronic energy. Assuming that ψ is a H_{el} ground state for a given $\vec{u}$, the total energy is now given by the functional $F_{ad}(\vec{u}) = \sum_i \frac{1}{2}u_i^2 + E(u_i)$ which depends only on the displacement variables. The ψ wave function may be non-unique.

Working with the L_∞ norm in the suitable space, the F functional and its derivatives with respect to u_i and ψ_ν are continue. The adiabatic potential F_{ad} is also continue in the $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{N})$ space but its first derivatives are not necessary continue as it can be shown in the AI limit.

III. THE ANTI-INTEGRABLE LIMIT

In the anti-integrable (AI) limit, the fermionic charge transfer is zero, and thus the whole lattice sites are decoupled. The Hamiltonian H_{el} is a sum of onsite Hamiltonian H_i and the H_{el} ground state ψ is a product of onsite eigenstate π_i with the energy $E_i(u_i)$:

$$H_i = (\frac{u_i}{2} - \mu)n_i + Un_{i\uparrow}n_{i\downarrow} \quad (3.1)$$

$$H_i|\pi_i\rangle = E_i(u_i)|\pi_i\rangle \quad (3.2)$$

The constants (μ, U) fix which type of state is the H_i ground state for a given displacement u_i . Selecting a set of N_{el} onsite states which have the lowest energy E_i provides an electronic ground state ψ for H_{el} . The site i is occupied either by a bipolaron, i.e., 2 electrons with opposite spin or by a polaron, i.e., only 1 electron with spin up or down or else the site i is not occupied. Using Eq. 2.9, the optimum displacement field is such that $u_i = -1$ for a bipolaron, or $u_i = -1/2$ for a polaron or $u_i = 0$ if the site i is unoccupied. In the case of a bipolaron onsite ground state with the optimum displacement $u_i = -1$, the H_i eigenvalues are $(U - 2\mu - 1, -\mu - 1/2, 0)$. For a polaron, the H_i eigenvalues are $(U - 2\mu - 1/2, -\mu - 1/4, 0)$ and for a vacuum site $(U - 2\mu, -\mu, 0)$. In order to determine whether a polaron structure is a local F_{ad} minimum, it is sufficient to test the H_i ground state for the different values of the onsite displacement $u_i \in \{-1, -1/2, 0\}$. As example, for $\mu = -3/32$ and $U = 3/8$, the H_i ground state is a bipolaron for $u_i = -1$, a polaron for $u_i = -1/2$, and it is a vacuum for $u_i = 0$, so any displacement field consisting of an assembly of $u_i \in \{-1, -1/2, 0\}$ is a F_{ad} minimum. On the opposite, if $\mu = -1/8$ and $U = 1$, the configuration which contains at least a displacement $u_i = -1$ are not stable because the bipolaron is no longer the H_i ground state.

Let us note δ_i the onsite spectrum gap between the ground state energy and the first excited state energy. This gap is non-zero $\delta_i > 0$ excepted for some specific values of (μ, U) . As a consequence for nearly all (μ, U) constants, the onsite ground state is not degenerate excepting the spin degeneracy which occurs for the polaron.

IV. EXPANSION OF POLARON STRUCTURES

As soon as the transfer integral t is non zero, one may guess that the AI polaron states should still be F_{ad} minima, at least for a certain range of parameter. Here we propose a proof that confirms this guess. Our demonstration is based on the F_{ad} gradient study in the space of the displacement configurations $\mathcal{S}(N)$. The F_{ad} gradient is given by:

$$\phi_i = u_i + \frac{\langle \psi | n_i | \psi \rangle}{2} \quad (4.1)$$

Let us introduce the following operators:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{1,i} &= n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} \\ P_{2,i} &= n_{i\uparrow} (1 - n_{i\downarrow}) \\ P_{3,i} &= n_{i\downarrow} (1 - n_{i\uparrow}) \\ P_{4,i} &= 1 - n_{i\downarrow} - n_{i\uparrow} + n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

They verify $\sum_{\alpha} P_{\alpha,i} | \psi \rangle = | \psi \rangle$ for all ψ state. We choose to note $P_{\alpha,i} | \psi \rangle = x_{\alpha,i} | \psi_{\alpha,i} \rangle$ where the state $\psi_{\alpha,i}$ is normalized and $x_{\alpha,i}$ is a real positive scalar. The gap δ_i is assumed to have a lower bound δ , i.e., $\delta_i > \delta > 0$ which is valid for nearly all (μ, U) constants. Then only one $x_{\alpha,i}$ is non-zero at the AI limit and it is equal to one, the corresponding index α is noted g_i . If g_i is equal to either 1 or 4 then we note $x_{g_i} = x_{\alpha=g_i,i}$. If g_i is equal to either 2 or 3, the site i is occupied by a polaron with a spin up or down. In such a case, the onsite ground state is spin-degenerate and we note $x_{g_i} = \sqrt{x_{2,i}^2 + x_{3,i}^2}$. As soon as the electronic transfer is non-zero, x_{g_i} variates with t and it can be proved that (see Lemma VI):

$$(1 - x_{g,i}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \frac{2n_c n_s^{\frac{1}{2}} t}{\delta - t n_c (n_s - 2)} \quad (4.3)$$

where n_c is the number of the nearest neighbors, n_s is the number of distinct H_i eigen values. The inequality Eq. (4.3) implies the continuity of $x_{g,i}$ with respect to t in the vicinity of the AI limit.

The potential F_{ad} is now derived with respect to u_i :

$$\phi_i = \frac{\partial F_{ad}}{\partial u_i} = u_i + \sum_{\alpha, \beta} x_{\alpha,i} x_{\beta,i} \cdot \langle \psi_{\alpha,i} | \frac{n_i}{2} | \psi_{\beta,i} \rangle \quad (4.4)$$

As $P_{\alpha,i} P_{\beta,i} = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} P_{\alpha,i}$ where $\delta_{\alpha,\beta}$ is the Kroeneker symbol and as n_i commutes with the $P_{\alpha,i}$ operators:

$$\phi_i = u_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha} x_{\alpha,i}^2 \langle \psi_{\alpha,i} | n_i | \psi_{\alpha,i} \rangle \quad (4.5)$$

Let note $n_{\alpha,i} = \langle \psi_{\alpha,i} | n_i | \psi_{\alpha,i} \rangle$ and let write $u_i = u_i(0) + \rho_i$ where $u_i(0)$ is the onsite displacement at $t = 0$. The Eq.(4.5) is rewritten as follows

$$\phi_i = \rho_i - \frac{n_{g,i}}{2} (1 - x_{g,i}^2) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \neq g_i} x_{\alpha,i}^2 n_{\alpha,i} \quad (4.6)$$

where we used Eq. (2.9) in the AI limit to find $u_i(0) = -\frac{n_{g_i}}{2}$. The sum in the right hand side of Eq. (4.6) is performed over the indexes $\alpha \neq g_i$ for $g_i = \{1, 4\}$ and over the indexes $\alpha = \{1, 4\}$ for $g_i = \{2, 3\}$.

The scalar product $\vec{\rho} \cdot \vec{\phi}$ is now detailed:

$$\vec{\rho} \cdot \vec{\phi} = \sum_i \rho_i^2 + \rho_i \cdot \left(-(1 - x_{g_i}^2) \frac{n_{g_i}}{2} + \sum_{\alpha \neq g_i} x_{\alpha,i}^2 \frac{n_{\alpha,i}}{2} \right) \quad (4.7)$$

Focussing on the terms of the right hand side sum, some simple arguments give the following inequalities:

$$\rho_i \cdot (1 - x_{g_i}^2) \frac{n_{g_i}}{2} < \sup_i (1 - x_{g_i}^2) |\rho_i| \quad (4.8)$$

$$\rho_i \cdot \sum_{\alpha \neq g_i} x_{\alpha,i}^2 \frac{n_{\alpha,i}}{2} > -\sup_i (1 - x_{g_i}^2) |\rho_i| \quad (4.9)$$

So each term of the sum in the Eq. (4.7) verifies

$$\rho_i^2 + \rho_i \cdot \left(-(1 - x_{g_i}^2) \frac{n_{g_i}}{2} + \sum_{\alpha \neq g_i} x_{\alpha,i}^2 \frac{n_{\alpha,i}}{2} \right) > \rho_i^2 - 2|\rho_i| \cdot \sup_i (1 - x_{g_i}^2) \quad (4.10)$$

which is positive if $|\rho_i| > 2\sup_i (1 - x_{g_i}^2)$ and with Eq. (4.3) it is equivalent to $|\rho_i| > R_{AI}$ with writing:

$$R_{AI} = \frac{8n_c^2 n_s t^2}{(\delta - tn_c(n_s - 1))^2} \quad (4.11)$$

Defining the subset $\mathcal{B}(R)$ such as $\vec{u} \in \mathcal{B}(R)$ if $|u_i(0) - u_i| < R$ for all i index, the boundary of $\mathcal{B}(R)$ is noted $B(R)$. For any $\vec{u} \in B(R > R_{AI})$, the product $(\vec{u}(0) - \vec{u}) \cdot \vec{\phi}(\vec{u})$ is positive and thus there is at least one displacement configuration $\vec{u}_{min}(t) \in \mathcal{B}(R_{AI})$ which is a local minimum of F_{ad} . As a consequence, The potential F_{ad} has a minimum in the $\vec{u}(0)$ vicinity at most at a R_{AI} distance in the L_∞ norm meaning, i.e., $\sup_i |u_{min,i}(t) - u_i(0)| < R_{AI}$.

V. CONCLUSION

The present proof holds for any displacement field which is a minimum of the adiabatic potential F_{ad} in the AI limit and such as the gap $\delta \neq 0$. For nearly all (μ, U) values,

the displacements of the polaronic minima vary continuously with respect to the fermion transfer t in the vicinity of the AI limit where $t=0$. So it is about the total energy of these minima because of the F_{ad} continuity with respect to the displacements. Consequently, the adiabatic potential has some minima with a many-polaron structure in a finite region of the phase diagram. Nevertheless, the absolute minimum of F_{ad} , i.e., the ground state of Holstein-Hubbard model can not yet be determined for all the parameters. To that purpose, a numerical investigation might be required but no idea emerge to tackle the case of a non zero Hubbard coupling with many charge carriers, excepted to compute a meanfield as proposed in Ref. [2] or to study a model with a small electron number. The latter possibility is presented in [6,7] where the phase diagram is calculated for 2 electrons. For a two-dimensional atomic lattice, a critical point where coexist 3 different types of bipolaron was found far from any trivial limit. In this specific region, because of the bipolaron degeneracy, the bipolaron tunneling (or equivalently the inverse of the ground state effective mass) is very sensitive to the quantum fluctuations which are yielded by a non-zero γ (Eq. (2.5)) Ref. [8]. Around the critical point, both the bipolaron ground state mobility and its binding energy reach $100K$ with realistic input parameters (Eq. (2.5)). This result allowed some conjectures about the mechanism which yields the high critical temperature superconductivity of cuprates.

The present study can be extended straightforwardly for a non harmonic phonon potential as for an atomic lattice embedded in an external magnetic field. However an extension to a different electron-phonon coupling such as the SSH model [11] might have non trivial anti-integrable limit which makes our arguments much less efficient.

VI. LEMMA

We choose the H_i ground state energy as the energy reference. We shall assume the non-degeneracy of this ground state so only one projector P_{g_i} is such as $H_i P_{g_i} |\psi\rangle = 0$ for all ψ . As $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} P_{\alpha,i} |\psi\rangle$ we have $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} x_{\alpha,i} |\psi_{\alpha,i}\rangle$ where is introduced the normalized states $|\psi_{\alpha,i}\rangle$ and $x_{\alpha,i} |\psi_{\alpha,i}\rangle = P_{\alpha,i} |\psi\rangle$ which implies $\sum_{\alpha} |x_{\alpha,i}|^2 = 1$. It is possible to choose the $|\psi_{\alpha,i}\rangle$ such as the $x_{\alpha,i}$ are real positive for all α . One notes $K_i = \sum_{\alpha} P_{\alpha,i} H_{el} P_{\alpha,i}$ and $H_{\bar{i}} = H_{el} - H_i + t \sum_{j:\sigma} C_{i,\sigma}^+ C_{j,\sigma} + C_{j,\sigma}^+ C_{i,\sigma}$ where $(i : j)$ are the i neighboring sites. As $P_{\alpha,i} [C_{i,\sigma}^+ C_{j,\sigma} + C_{j,\sigma}^+ C_{i,\sigma}] P_{\alpha,i} = 0$ and as $H_{\bar{i}}$ and H_i commute with the projectors $P_{\alpha,i}$:

$$K_i = H_{\bar{i}} + H_i \quad (6.1)$$

Let Φ_0 be the K_i ground state with energy E_0 . Using $P_{\alpha,i} P_{\beta,i} = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} P_{\alpha,i}$ where $\delta_{\alpha,\beta}$ is the Kroeneker symbol, then $K_i P_{\alpha,i} |\Phi_0\rangle = P_{\alpha,i} K_i |\Phi_0\rangle = E_0 P_{\alpha,i} |\Phi_0\rangle$.

As $H_{\bar{i}}$ and H_i are decoupled, the state ϕ_0 is a product of the $H_{\bar{i}}$ ground state and the H_i ground state. It follows that $P_{g_i} |\Phi_0\rangle = |\Phi_0\rangle$ and $P_{\alpha \neq g_i} |\Phi_0\rangle = 0$ and it is now easy to establish that

$$\langle \Phi_0 | H_{\bar{i}} | \Phi_0 \rangle = E_0 \quad (6.2)$$

$$\langle \Phi_0 | H_{el} | \Phi_0 \rangle = \langle \Phi_0 | K_i | \Phi_0 \rangle = E_0 \quad (6.3)$$

$$\langle \psi_{g_i} | K_i | \psi_{g_i} \rangle \geq E_0 \quad (6.4)$$

From the identity $P_{\alpha,i}^2 = P_{\alpha,i}$, one deduces that for all ψ , $|\psi_{\alpha,i}\rangle = P_{\alpha,i} |\psi\rangle$, $P_{\alpha,i} |\psi_{\alpha,i}\rangle = |\psi_{\alpha,i}\rangle$ and $\langle \psi_{\alpha,i} | K_i | \psi_{\alpha,i} \rangle = \langle \psi_{\alpha,i} | H_{el} | \psi_{\alpha,i} \rangle$. If δ_i is the first excited state energy of H_i :

$$\langle \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} | H_i | \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} \rangle \geq \delta_i \quad (6.5)$$

$$\langle \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} | K_i | \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} \rangle = \langle \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} | H_{\bar{1}} | \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} \rangle + \langle \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} | H_i | \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} \rangle \quad (6.6)$$

$$\langle \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} | K_i | \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} \rangle \geq \langle \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} | H_{\bar{1}} | \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} \rangle + \delta_i \geq E_0 + \delta_i \quad (6.7)$$

The previous results Eq. (6.7) is necessary valid if ψ is the H_{el} ground state:

$$\langle \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} | K_i | \psi_{\alpha \neq g_i, i} \rangle \geq E_0 + \delta_i \quad (6.8)$$

Multiplying H_{el} by the identity $(\sum_{\alpha} P_{\alpha, i} = Id)$ gives:

$$H_{el} = K_i + \sum_{\alpha \neq \alpha'} P_{\alpha, i} H_{el} P_{\alpha', i} \quad (6.9)$$

and bracketing by ψ :

$$\langle \psi | H_{el} | \psi \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} x_{\alpha, i}^2 \langle \psi_{\alpha, i} | K_i | \psi_{\alpha, i} \rangle + \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} x_{\alpha, i} x_{\beta, i} \langle \psi_{\alpha, i} | H_{el} | \psi_{\beta, i} \rangle \quad (6.10)$$

As $n_{i, \sigma}$ and $n_{j, \sigma'}$ commute with each other for all suffix i, j, σ and σ' , and as $P_{\alpha, i} P_{\beta \neq \alpha, i} = 0$:

$$\sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} x_{\alpha, i} x_{\beta, i} \langle \psi_{\alpha, i} | H_{el} | \psi_{\beta, i} \rangle = -t \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} x_{\alpha, i} x_{\beta, i} \langle \psi_{\alpha, i} | \Delta | \psi_{\beta, i} \rangle \quad (6.11)$$

One deduces a simplification of the Eq. (6.10):

$$\langle \psi | H_{el} | \psi \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} x_{\alpha, i}^2 \langle \psi_{\alpha, i} | K_i | \psi_{\alpha, i} \rangle - t \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} x_{\alpha, i} x_{\beta, i} \langle \psi_{\alpha, i} | \Delta | \psi_{\beta, i} \rangle \quad (6.12)$$

and combining the inequalities (6.4, 6.8):

$$\langle \psi | H_{el} | \psi \rangle \geq E_0 + \delta_i \sum_{\alpha \neq g_i} x_{\alpha, i}^2 - t \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} x_{\alpha, i} x_{\beta, i} \langle \psi_{\alpha, i} | \Delta | \psi_{\beta, i} \rangle \quad (6.13)$$

As we choose to map the atomic lattice on $\mathcal{Z}^d$, the number of first neighboring sites is $n_c = 2d$. With Eq. (6.3), one now writes the set of following equations where $E = \langle \psi | H_{el} | \psi \rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Phi_0 | H_{el} | \Phi_0 \rangle &\geq E \\
E_0 \geq E &\rightarrow E_0 \geq E \geq E_0 + \delta_i \sum_{\alpha \neq g_i} x_{\alpha,i}^2 - t \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} x_{\alpha,i} x_{\beta,i} \langle \psi_{\alpha,i} | \Delta | \psi_{\beta,i} \rangle \\
\langle \psi_{\alpha,i} | \Delta | \psi_{\beta,i} \rangle &= \langle \psi_{\alpha,i} | \sum_{i,j,\sigma} C_{i,\sigma}^+ C_{j,\sigma} + C_{j,\sigma}^+ C_{i,\sigma} | \psi_{\beta,i} \rangle \leq 2n_c \\
\delta_i \sum_{\alpha \neq g_i} x_{\alpha,i}^2 &\leq t \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} x_{\alpha,i} x_{\beta,i} \langle \psi_{\alpha,i} | \Delta | \psi_{\beta,i} \rangle \\
\delta_i (1 - x_{g_i}^2) &\leq 2n_c t \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} x_{\alpha,i} x_{\beta,i} \\
(1 - x_{g_i}^2) \delta_i &\leq n_c t [(\sum_{\alpha} x_{\alpha,i})^2 - \sum_{\alpha} x_{\alpha,i}^2] \\
(1 - x_{g_i}^2) \delta_i &\leq n_c t [(\sum_{\alpha} x_{\alpha,i})^2 - 1] \\
(1 - x_{g_i}^2) \delta_i &\leq n_c t [(\sum_{\alpha \neq g} x_{\alpha,i} + x_{g_i})^2 - 1] \tag{6.14}
\end{aligned}$$

The Cauchy-Schwartz inequality applied to the sum $\sum_{\alpha \neq g} x_{\alpha,i}$ gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\alpha \neq g} x_{\alpha,i} &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{\alpha \neq g_i} 1} \sqrt{\sum_{\alpha \neq g_i} x_{\alpha,i}^2} \\
\sum_{\alpha \neq g_i} x_{\alpha,i} &\leq \sqrt{n_s} \sqrt{1 - x_{g_i}^2}
\end{aligned}$$

where $n_s = 3$ is the maximum number of distinct H_i eigenvalues. With Eq. (6.14), it follows that

$$(1 - x_{g_i}^2) \delta_i \leq n_c t [(n_s^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 - x_{g_i}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + x_{g_i})^2 - 1] \tag{6.15}$$

and it is now easy to obtain:

$$(1 - x_{g_i}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \frac{2n_c n_s^{\frac{1}{2}} t}{\delta_i - n_c t (n_s - 1)} \quad (6.16)$$

The latest result holds for the case of a non-degenerate H_i ground state. Regarding the case of a polaron at site i , the atomic orbital is occupied by 1 electron with either spin up or spin down. The onsite ground state is spin-degenerate but the same arguments as for the non-degenerate case can be used to establish the following inequality:

$$(1 - x_{2,i}^2 - x_{3,i}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \frac{2n_c (n_s - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} t}{\delta_i - n_c t (n_s - 2)} \quad (6.17)$$

Let write $x_{g_i}^2 = x_{2,i}^2 + x_{3,i}^2$ such as this inequality is now written:

$$(1 - x_{g,i}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \frac{2n_c (n_s - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} t}{\delta_i - n_c t (n_s - 2)} \quad (6.18)$$

If we now assum that there is a lower bound δ for the onsite gap $\delta_i > \delta > 0$, then the combination of the Eqs. (6.16, 6.18) gives for all site i :

$$(1 - x_{g_i}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \frac{2n_c n_s^{\frac{1}{2}} t}{\delta - n_c t (n_s - 2)} \quad (6.19)$$

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Emin and T. Holstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **36** 323 (1976) and
D. Emin, Physics Today, **34** June (1982).
- [2] S. Aubry, G. Abramovici and J.L. Raimbault, J. Stat. Phys. **67**, 675 (1992).
- [3] P. Quemerais, D. Campbell, J.L. Raimbault and S. Aubry, Int. J. of Mod. Phys., **B7**,
4289 (1993).
- [4] J.L. Raimbault and S. Aubry, Journal of Physics C **7**, 8287 (1995).
- [5] J.P. Lorenzo and S. Aubry, Physica D **113**, 276 (1998).
- [6] L. Proville and S. Aubry, Physica D **113**, 307 (1998).
- [7] L. Proville and S. Aubry, Eur. Phys. J. **B11**, 41 (1999).
- [8] L. Proville and S. Aubry, Eur. Phys. J. **B15**, 405 (1999).
- [9] C. Baesens and R.S. MacKay, Nonlinearity **7**, 59 (1994).
- [10] S. Aubry, *The Concept of Anti-Integrability: Definition, Theorems and Applications* in
Twist Mappings and their Applications eds. Richard McGehee and Kenneth R. Meyer,
The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and Applications **44** (1992) pp.7-54 (Springer).
- [11] W.P. Su, J.R. Schrieffer and A.J. Heeger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **25**, 1968 (1979); Phys. Rev.
B **22**, 2099 (1980).